

1 Justin E. Sterling, State Bar No. 249491
2 LAW OFFICES OF JUSTIN STERLING
3 Justin@SterlingDefense.com
4 15760 Ventura Blvd. Suite 700
5 Encino, CA 91436
6 Tel. (818) 995-9452/Fax. (818) 824-3533

7 Erin Darling, State Bar No. 259724
8 LAW OFFICES OF ERIN DARLING
9 Erin@ErinDarlingLaw.com
10 3435 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 2910
11 Los Angeles, CA 90010
12 Tel. (323) 736-2230

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff Ariana Amore

14
15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
17

18 ARIANA AMORE,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS
22 ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION
23 DEPARTMENT, LOS ANGELES
24 COUNTY CHIEF PROBATION
25 OFFICER JERRY POWERS, DEPUTY
26 PROBATION OFFICER OSCAR
27 CALDERON, JR., DEPUTY
28 PROBATION OFFICER FNU
IBANEZ, DEPUTY PROBATION
OFFICER FNU GONZALEZ,
SUPERVISING DEPUTY
PROBATION OFFICER FNU
CODDINGTON, and DOES 1 TO 10,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-CV-5207-JAK

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
FOR DAMAGES FOR
VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS
UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 1983**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

29 **INTRODUCTION**

30 1. While employed by the County of Los Angeles as a juvenile probation
31 officer, defendant Deputy Probation Officer Oscar Calderon Jr. molested or sexually
32 abused multiple wards at Camp Scudder, a juvenile detention facility in Los Angeles
33 County. Plaintiff Ariana Amore is one of Officer Calderon's victims.

1 8. Defendant County of Los Angeles (“County”) is a legal and political entity
2 established under the laws of the State of California, with all of the powers specified
3 and necessarily implied by the Constitution and the laws of the State of California and
4 exercised by various government agents and officers. County is responsible for the
5 actions, omissions, policies, procedures, practices, and customs of its various agents
6 and agencies, including the Los Angeles County Probation Department and its agents
7 and employees. At all relevant times, County was responsible for ensuring that the
8 actions, omissions, policies, procedures, practices, and customs of its employees and
9 agents complied with the laws of the United States and of the State of California. At all
10 relevant times, County was the employer of each of the individually named defendants,
11 and Camp Scudder was a County-run facility.

12 9. Defendant Los Angeles County Probation Department (“LACPD”) is a
13 public agency. At the times relevant hereto, Defendant Los Angeles County Chief
14 Probation Officer Jerry Powers (“Chief Powers”) was the acting Chief Probation
15 Officer for the County of Los Angeles and is sued in both his official and individual
16 capacities. At all relevant times, LACPD and Chief Powers were responsible for
17 ensuring that the actions, omissions, policies, procedures, practices, and customs of its
18 employees and agents complied with the laws of the United States and of the State of
19 California. LACPD was the County agency responsible for operating Camp Scudder.

20 10. Defendant Oscar Calderon, Jr. (“Officer Calderon”) is a deputy probation
21 officer for the LACPD. At all relevant times, Officer Calderon was a duly authorized
22 employee and agent of the County of Los Angeles, subject to oversight and supervision
23 by the County’s elected and non-elected officials, and was acting under color of law and
24 within the course and scope of his duties as a deputy probation officer for the LACPD
25 and with complete authority and ratification of their principal, County. In committing
26 the acts alleged herein, Officer Calderon acted within the scope of his respective
27 employment and under color of law. Officer Calderon is sued in both his official and
28 individual capacities.

1 11. Defendant Deputy Probation Officer (first name unknown, hereinafter,
2 “FNU”) Ibanez (“Officer Ibanez”) is a female deputy probation officer for the
3 LACPD. At all relevant times, Officer Ibanez was a duly authorized employee and
4 agent of the County of Los Angeles, subject to oversight and supervision by the
5 County’s elected and non-elected officials, and was acting under color of law and
6 within the course and scope of her duties as a deputy probation officer for the LACPD
7 and with complete authority and ratification of their principal, County. In committing
8 the acts alleged herein, Officer Ibanez acted within the scope of her respective
9 employment and under color of law. Plaintiff does not know Officer Ibanez’s first
10 name but will seek leave to amend the complaint should she learn it. Officer Ibanez is
11 sued in both her official and individual capacities.

12 12. Defendant Deputy Probation Officer FNU Gonzalez (“Officer
13 Gonzalez”) is a male deputy probation officer for the LACPD. At all relevant times,
14 Officer Gonzalez was a duly authorized employee and agent of the County of Los
15 Angeles, subject to oversight and supervision by the County’s elected and non-elected
16 officials, and was acting under color of law and within the course and scope of his
17 duties as a deputy probation officer for the LACPD and with complete authority and
18 ratification of their principal, County. In committing the acts alleged herein, Officer
19 Ibanez acted within the scope of his respective employment and under color of law.
20 Plaintiff does not know Officer Gonzalez’s first name but will seek leave to amend the
21 complaint should she learn it. Officer Gonzalez is sued in both his official and
22 individual capacities.

23 13. Defendant Supervising Deputy Probation Officer FNU Coddington
24 (“Supervising Officer Coddington”) is a female supervising deputy probation officer
25 for the LACPD. At all relevant times, Officer Calderon was a duly authorized employee
26 and agent of the County of Los Angeles, subject to oversight and supervision by the
27 County’s elected and non-elected officials, and was acting under color of law and
28 within the course and scope of his duties as a deputy probation officer for the LACPD

1 and with complete authority and ratification of their principal, County. In committing
2 the acts alleged herein, Supervising Officer Coddington acted within the scope of her
3 respective employment and under color of law. Plaintiff does not know Supervising
4 Officer Coddington's first name but will seek leave to amend the complaint should she
5 learn it. Supervising Officer Coddington is sued in both her official and individual
6 capacities.

7 14. The true names of defendants Does 1 through 10 are presently unknown
8 to Plaintiff, who therefore sues each of these defendants by such fictitious name; but
9 upon ascertaining the true identity of a defendant Doe, Plaintiff will amend this
10 complaint or seek leave to do so by inserting the true and correct name in lieu of the
11 fictitious name. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on the basis of such information
12 and belief alleges that each defendant Doe herein is in some manner responsible for the
13 injuries and damages alleged herein. Each individually named Doe defendant, like each
14 individually named defendant, acted under color of law and within the scope of his or
15 her agency and employment with the County and LACPD. Each Doe is sued in both
16 his/her official and individual capacities.

17 **FACTS PERTINENT TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

18 15. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation in paragraphs 1
19 through 14 of this complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

20 16. Plaintiff Ariana Amore was remanded to the custody of the LACPD in
21 reference to *In the Matter of Ariana A., Case No. MJ21440*. Plaintiff was detained at
22 Camp Scudder between November 2014 and July 2015.

23 17. During her time at Camp Scudder, Plaintiff was under the direct
24 supervision of Officer Calderon. As a deputy probation officer, Officer Calderon was
25 responsible for the care, safety and control of Plaintiff, and was tasked with performing
26 case management and life-skills assessment activities for Plaintiff. Officer Calderon's
27 responsibilities included preparing court reports that tracked Plaintiff's behavior and
28 progress while at Camp Scudder. Such court reports, whether reflecting negative or

1 positive upon Plaintiff, could influence the court's rulings in *In the Matter of Ariana A.*,
2 *Case No. MJ21440*, including Plaintiff's release date.

3 18. On at least two occasions, Officer Calderon told Plaintiff that if she
4 refused to obey him, "I will fuck up your court reports."

5 19. Officer Calderon exercised discretion over Plaintiff in a variety of other
6 ways, including, deciding where Plaintiff worked at Camp Scudder (camp wards are
7 assigned various jobs), what personal items sent by family from outside Camp Scudder
8 (such as shampoo) that Plaintiff could actually receive, and how many phone calls to
9 family she could make.

10 20. While supervising Plaintiff, Officer Calderon would engage in unwanted
11 flirtatious behavior with her. Some of Officer Calderon's odd, flirtatious behavior
12 towards Plaintiff occurred in front of other LACPD officers. For instance, on multiple
13 occasions, at night, just before the lights were turned off in the camp wards' dormitory
14 for sleep, Officer Calderon would call Plaintiff out of bed and have her sit at a lunch
15 bench in the dormitory with him. Officer Calderon would order Plaintiff to remain
16 seated with him after the lights were turned off. Plaintiff had nothing to say to Officer
17 Calderon and the two would sit in silence, in the dark, until Officer Calderon permitted
18 Plaintiff to return to her bed to sleep. Other LACPD officers, Does 1-10, observed this
19 and never said anything to Officer Calderon and never intervened on Plaintiff's behalf.
20 During these times, LACPD supervising officers remained in their office, or in some
21 other location, and were never present for oversight of Officer Calderon.

22 21. Officer Calderon engaged in inappropriate public behavior towards
23 Plaintiff on other occasions. In Plaintiff's first couple months at Camp Scudder,
24 Officer Calderon routinely brought her food from outside the facility. This was an odd,
25 uncommon practice. Plaintiff was hungry and accepted the food but did not like the
26 attention it brought to her. Other LACPD officers, including supervising officers, saw
27 Officer Calderon's rare treatment of Plaintiff and joked with her. Comments to
28 Plaintiff included, "you got the juice!" – as if Plaintiff had the privilege of Officer

1 Calderon's attention, or had influence over him. Plaintiff felt cornered by the attention,
2 and because LACPD officer had joked about the treatment rather than intervene,
3 Plaintiff did not feel comfortable confiding in them that she felt threatened by Officer
4 Calderon.

5 22. Officer Calderon combined his odd, flirtatious behavior towards Plaintiff
6 with assertions of his power over her. On some occasions, Plaintiff would complain to
7 Officer Calderon of his unfair treatment of her and critique his behavior. Officer
8 Calderon would respond, "I'm in charge," "I have the fucking power," and "I can do
9 what I want."

10 23. Plaintiff wrote her godfather a letter complaining of Officer Calderon's
11 inappropriate behavior towards her, including that he would bring her dinner at night.
12 In response, Plaintiff's godfather contacted Supervising Officer Coddington in person,
13 telling her about Officer Calderon's inappropriate behavior and that he suspected
14 something was not right with Officer Calderon's supervision of Plaintiff. Supervising
15 Officer Coddington told Plaintiff's godfather that she trusted Officer Calderon "100%"
16 and trusted him "like my own son." Plaintiff's godfather told Supervising Officer
17 Coddington that he wanted to make a complaint. Supervising Officer Coddington told
18 Plaintiff's godfather that she was the person to whom he could make complaints.
19 Supervising Officer Coddington did not investigate Officer Calderon after being put on
20 notice of his inappropriate behavior.

21 24. While supervising Plaintiff, Officer Calderon also engaged in
22 inappropriate physical behavior with her in private. Examples include placing Plaintiff
23 in a pretend chokehold, pressing his body against hers, and turning her around to kiss
24 her. In addition, during the times that Plaintiff was permitted to make phone calls to
25 her family, Officer Calderon would be seated next to Plaintiff. During these phone
26 calls, Officer Calderon would occasionally "scissor" his legs with Plaintiffs, intertwining
27 his legs in between hers. Once, Officer Calderon elevated his unwanted touching of
28 Plaintiff while she was speaking on the telephone by trailing her fingers with his fingers

1 and touching her legs in a kind of soft, rubbing motion. With Officer Calderon right
2 next to her, Plaintiff did not feel comfortable reporting to her family over the phone
3 what was happening to her, despite feeling scared and disturbed.

4 25. On a later date, and in a private setting, Plaintiff mustered up the courage
5 and told a therapist at Camp Scudder that Officer Calderon had touched her while she
6 was on the phone. Plaintiff did not tell the therapist about the entire pattern of Officer
7 Calderon's behavior. Plaintiff does not remember the therapist's name but recalls her as
8 short, fit, skinny and Hispanic. Much to Plaintiff's chagrin, days after talking to the
9 therapist, Officer Calderon came and pulled Plaintiff out of class. Officer Calderon
10 suspected that Plaintiff had told the therapist of his physical advances and asked her,
11 "what did you tell her?!" Plaintiff was terrified that her secrets were being shared with
12 Officer Calderon. Plaintiff desperately wanted to tell someone about Officer Calderon's
13 treatment of her but figured that if she could not trust her therapist then she could not
14 trust anyone at Camp Scudder. As a result, Plaintiff gave up trying to resist Officer
15 Calderon.

16 26. Plaintiff alleges that Officer Calderon suspected her of telling the therapist
17 because the therapist had told LACPD officers and/or supervising officers about
18 Officer Calderon touching Plaintiff while she was on the phone, and the rumor spread
19 amongst LACPD officers. Despite Officer Calderon contacting Plaintiff, no other
20 LACPD officer or staff ever contacted Plaintiff or intervened on her behalf about the
21 incident.

22 27. Plaintiff was afraid to report Officer Calderon's treatment of her because
23 she feared retaliation. Plaintiff repeatedly heard Officer Calderon and other LACPD
24 officers actively discourage camp wards from making complaints. During her first few
25 months at Camp Scudder, Plaintiff would complain to LACPD officers about
26 treatment practices that she considered unfair. Officer Calderon, Officer Ibanez,
27 Officer Gonzalez, as well as other LACPD officers, Does 1-10, would say, "don't be a
28 snitch," and "snitches get stitches," and "you don't want a snitch jacket on you," to

1 dissuade complaints. Officer Calderon, Officer Ibanez, and Officer Gonzalez, as well
2 as other LACPD officers, Does 1-10, would also dissuade complaints by saying, “don’t
3 make me have to do more paperwork,” and “you’re just making more work for me.”
4 As a result, Plaintiff was further dissuaded from reaching out to any other LACPD
5 officer to complain about Officer Calderon.

6 28. In Camp Scudder’s environment of LACPD officers actively discouraging
7 complaints, and without oversight by LACPD supervising officers, Officer Calderon’s
8 behavior towards Plaintiff escalated from strange, aggressive, and flirtatious, to outright
9 and repeated sexual abuse.

10 29. From around April 2015 through around June 2015 --after Plaintiff had
11 been under Officer Calderon’s supervision for around six months – Officer Calderon
12 assigned Plaintiff to work at the snack shop. The snack shop was part of the “Al Jones”
13 rewards points system, whereby camp wards earn treats for good behavior. Plaintiff’s
14 job was to distribute chips, candy, and other sweets to her fellow camp wards on the
15 weekly basis when the snack shop was open.

16 30. The snack shop was located in a remote part of Camp Scudder, behind
17 the athletic track and away from any other structure. The snack shop was not regularly
18 monitored by any LACPD officer or supervising officer. The snack shop itself was a
19 small enclosed structure with a ledge that opened up, allowing the person inside to
20 distribute treats to anyone assembled outside. The area below the ledge was closed off
21 and unobservable from outside.

22 31. During her weekly shift working at the snack shop, Plaintiff stood on her
23 feet, performing her assigned tasks. Meanwhile, Officer Calderon would be seated,
24 obscured from view from outside.

25 32. While inside the snack shop, Officer Calderon routinely sexually assaulted
26 Plaintiff. Officer Calderon would kiss Plaintiff’s body, he would quickly pull her
27 towards him, and he would grab intimate areas. In particular, Officer Calderon groped
28 Plaintiff’s breasts, squeezed Plaintiff’s butt, and grabbed Plaintiff’s vagina. Officer

1 Calderon also penetrated Plaintiff's vagina with his finger.

2 33. Overall, Officer Calderon sexually abused Plaintiff in the snack shop on
3 around ten occasions in the period from around April 2015 to around June 2015.

4 34. On these occasions of sexual abuse inside the snack shop, Plaintiff
5 squirmed away from Officer Calderon but could not get him to stop. Officer Calderon
6 restrained Plaintiff by his physical presence. Officer Calderon is at least 6-feet, 1-inches
7 in height, and weighs at least 250 pounds. Plaintiff is 5-feet, 2-inches, and weighs
8 approximately 120 pounds. The enclosed snack shop --a small space located in a
9 remote area of Camp Scudder -- was not visited by any other LACPD officers to whom
10 she could cry for help.

11 35. During this time, Officer Calderon would frequently tell Plaintiff that he
12 had a crush on her, and that because she had recently turned 18, it "wouldn't be a
13 problem," because she was "legal." At no time did Plaintiff consent to Officer
14 Calderon touching her.

15 36. Plaintiff did not feel safe to complain to LACPD officers and staff after
16 she was victimized by Officer Calderon. Plaintiff did not know how to prevent the
17 weekly sexual abuse. Plaintiff had heard LACPD officers, such as Officers Calderon,
18 Ibanez, and Gonzalez, warn camp wards to not "snitch" and not file complaints against
19 them. Plaintiff worried that if she told other girls at Camp Scudder then she would get
20 in more trouble for snitching.

21 37. Plaintiff was further dissuaded from making complaints by Officer
22 Calderon's supervisor, Supervising Officer Coddington. On one occasion, having
23 already been sexually abused by Officer Calderon, Supervising Officer Coddington told
24 Plaintiff, "you're brainwashing Calderon." Plaintiff felt like Supervising Officer
25 Coddington was blaming her for being sexually abused. Other LACPD officers had
26 observed Officer Calderon's aggressive, flirtatious behavior towards her in the
27 dormitory and Supervising Officer Coddington was aware of it, blamed Plaintiff for the
28 unwanted attention, but did nothing to prevent Officer Calderon's abuse.

1 38. Supervising Officer Coddington was responsible for ensuring that the
2 actions of her subordinates complied with written policies, did not violate the law, and
3 that each LACBPD officer was properly supervised. At all relevant times, Supervising
4 Officer Coddington never intervened against Officer Calderon on Plaintiff's behalf,
5 either personally or through one of her subordinates, or ensured that he was properly
6 supervised despite multiple public displays of inappropriate behavior towards Plaintiff.

7 39. Plaintiff's isolation from any protection by LACPD officer or staff was
8 made worse by the fact that Officer Calderon was still responsible for Plaintiff's court
9 reports and Plaintiff did not want a negative review of her to extend her time at Camp
10 Scudder.

11 40. Plaintiff was released from Camp Scudder on July 17, 2015.

12 41. On January 25, 2017, Officer Calderon was arrested and charged with six
13 felony counts – 2 counts of lewd acts upon a child and 4 counts of assault under color
14 of authority. Reference is made to *People of the State of California vs. Oscar D. Calderon, Jr.*,
15 LASC Case No. BA453651.

16 42. Chief Powers, Supervising Officer Coddington, and other LACPD
17 supervising officers were on notice that Officer Calderon was engaging in conduct in
18 violation of written policy, including policies deterring sexual abuse and impropriety.

19 43. Chief Powers, Supervising Officer Coddington, and other LACPD
20 supervising officers failed to act to prevent Officer Calderon from engaging in this
21 conduct. Since the written policies were designed, at least in part, to prevent and deter
22 sexual abuse, Chief Powers, Supervising Officer Coddington, and other LACPD
23 supervising officers knew or reasonably should have known that the failure to enforce
24 these policies heightened the danger of sexual abuse of wards by Officer Calderon.

25 44. As a result of Chief Powers, Supervising Officer Coddington, and other
26 LACPD supervising officers' failure to supervise Officer Calderon, prior to the sexual
27 abuse of Plaintiff, Officer Calderon's misconduct and violations of policy were never
28 reported or properly investigated; the internal culture of LACPD officers intimidating

1 camp wards from making complaints by warning against “snitches” was never
2 addressed; public inappropriate behavior by Officer Calderon towards camp wards was
3 never timely investigated; and Officer Calderon was not subject to timely LACPD
4 discipline.

5 45. If Officer Calderon had been adequately trained and supervised prior to
6 the sexual abuse of Plaintiff, if his errant behavior had been timely investigated, and if
7 he had been timely punished as a result, then the sexual abuse of Plaintiff in this case
8 could have been averted.

9 DAMAGES

10 46. As a direct and proximate result of aforesaid acts and omissions, and the
11 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the defendants alleged in this complaint,
12 Plaintiff suffered and will continue to suffer great emotional, mental and physical pain,
13 anguish, fright, nervousness, anxiety, shock, humiliation, indignity, embarrassment,
14 harm to reputation, and apprehension, which have caused and will continue to cause,
15 Plaintiff to sustain general damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

16 47. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions, customs,
17 practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned Defendants, Plaintiff suffered
18 the denial of her fundamental constitutional rights guaranteed by the First, Fourth,
19 Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution, which have
20 caused Plaintiff to sustain damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

21 48. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,
22 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned Defendants, Plaintiff
23 incurred and will continue to incur medical expenses, including psychological
24 treatment.

25 49. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions,
26 customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned Defendants, Plaintiff
27 suffered past and future losses of income that have caused her to sustain economic
28 damages in a sum to be determined at trial.

72. As a result of the conduct of Officer Calderon, Plaintiff was harmed.

73. Plaintiff specifically alleges that Defendants' complained of acts and/or omissions, were within each of their control, and within the feasibility of each of them, to alter, adjust, and/or correct so as to prevent some or all of the unlawful acts and injury complained of herein by Plaintiff.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of Civil Rights – 42 U.S.C. § 1983

(Fourteenth Amendment –Against Officer Calderon)

74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if re-alleged herein.

75. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was a ward of the court and incarcerated at Camp Scudder, a juvenile detention facility operated by the County.

76. Defendant Officer Calderon, while acting under color of law, sexually assaulted Plaintiff and engaged in the conduct described above, and thereby deprived Plaintiff of her civil rights under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

77. The force used by Officer Calderon upon Plaintiff while sexually assaulting her in custody was harmful, unwanted, and excessive.

78. The sexual assaults of Plaintiff by Officer Calderon, and Officer Calderon's conduct as described above, were unreasonable, unjustified, and offensive to human dignity. It was also with deliberate indifference to the rights and safety of Plaintiff.

79. The conduct of Officer Calderon was willful, wanton, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages.

80. As a result of the conduct of Officer Calderon, Plaintiff was harmed.

81. Plaintiff specifically alleges that Defendants' complained of acts and/or omissions, were within each of their control, and within the feasibility of each of them,

1 to alter, adjust, and/or correct so as to prevent some or all of the unlawful acts and
 2 injury complained of herein by Plaintiff.

3 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

4 **Violation Due Process – 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

5 (Fourteenth Amendment –Against Officer Calderon)

6 82. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in
 7 the foregoing paragraphs as if re-alleged herein.

8 83. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was a ward of the court and incarcerated at
 9 Camp Scudder, a juvenile detention facility operated by the County.

10 84. Plaintiff had a cognizable interest under the Due Process Clause of the
 11 Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution to be free from state actions
 12 that deprive her of life, liberty, or property in such a matter as to shock the conscience.

13 85. Defendant Officer Calderon, while acting under color of law and within
 14 the course and scope of his employment by the County and LACPD, sexually assaulted
 15 Plaintiff and engaged in the conduct described above, and thereby deprived Plaintiff of
 16 her civil rights under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

17 86. The aforementioned actions of Officer Calderon, along with undiscovered
 18 conduct, shock the conscience, in that he acted with deliberate indifference to the
 19 constitutional rights of Plaintiff.

20 87. The acts of Officer Calderon violated the substantive due process rights
 21 of Plaintiff.

22 88. The acts or omissions of Officer Calderon caused harm to Plaintiff.

23 89. The conduct of Officer Calderon was willful, wanton, malicious, and done
 24 with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff and therefore warrants the
 25 imposition of exemplary and punitive damages.

26 90. Plaintiff specifically alleges that Defendants' complained of acts and/or
 27 omissions, were within each of their control, and within the feasibility of each of them,
 28 to alter, adjust, and/or correct so as to prevent some or all of the unlawful acts and

injury complained of herein by Plaintiff.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Municipal Liability –Unconstitutional Custom, Practice, or Policy

42 U.S.C. § 1983

(Against County, LACPD, and Chief Powers)

91. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if re-alleged herein.

92. The individual defendants and Doe defendants acted under color of law and within the course and scope of their employment by the County and LACPD.

93. The individual defendants and Doe defendants deprived Plaintiff of her particular rights under the First Amendment, and Officer Calderon deprived Plaintiff of her Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments, as alleged above.

94. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that, at all times herein mentioned, defendants County, LACPD, the relevant policy maker, Chief Powers, and relevant County officials, whether named or unnamed (hereinafter referred to collectively as the entity defendants) maintain or tolerate unconstitutional customs, practices, and policies that facilitated the deprivation of Plaintiff's rights under the First, Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment, as alleged above.

95. The policies, customs, and practices described above are also evidenced by the victimization of Plaintiff and other camp wards by Officer Calderon.

96. Entity defendants had either actual or constructive knowledge of the deficient policies, practices and customs alleged in the paragraphs above. Said officials acted with deliberate indifference to the foreseeable effects and consequences of these policies, practices and customs with respect to the constitutional rights of Plaintiff and other wards similarly situated.

97. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions, customs, practices, policies and decisions of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff was injured and sustained damages as alleged above. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks compensatory

1 damages from all the entity defendants, and punitive damages from Chief Powers, in
2 his individual capacity only.

3 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

4 **Municipal Liability –Inadequate Training/Policy of Inaction**

5 **42 U.S.C. § 1983**

6 (Against County, LACPD, and Chief Powers)

7 98. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in
8 the foregoing paragraphs as if re-alleged herein.

9 99. The individual defendants and Doe defendants acted under color of law
10 and within the course and scope of their employment by the County and LACPD.

11 100. The individual defendants and Doe defendants deprived Plaintiff of her
12 particular rights under the First Amendment, and Officer Calderon deprived Plaintiff
13 of her Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments, as alleged above.

14 101. The training provided by the County, LACPD, and the relevant policy
15 maker, Chief Powers, and relevant County officials, whether named or unnamed
16 (hereinafter referred to collectively as the entity defendants) was not adequate to train
17 their probation officers and staff (including therapists) to handle the usual and
18 recurring situations with which they must deal. As evidenced by the numerous
19 instances of camp wards before Plaintiff, the entity defendants did not adequately train
20 their officers and staff to prevent, deter, detect, and avoid sexual abuse of camp wards
21 – and were on notice of such. Upon the same evidence, the entity defendants were also
22 on notice that they did not adequately train their officers and staff to intervene when
23 other officers are observed to be violating policies designed to prevent and deter sexual
24 abuse of camp wards.

25 102. The entity defendants were deliberately indifferent to the obvious
26 consequences of their failure to train their officers and staff adequately.

27 103. The failure of the entity defendants to provide adequate training caused
28 the deprivation of Plaintiff's rights.

104. The entity defendants maintained a policy and practice of inaction with respect to the violation of policies designed to prevent or deter sexual abuse of camp wards. LACPD officers who engaged in suspicious behavior, or behavior that violated written policy, were inadequately disciplined or otherwise not penalized in connection with sexual or otherwise inappropriate behavior towards camp wards.

105. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts, omissions, customs, practices, policies and practice of inaction of the aforementioned defendants, Plaintiff was injured and sustained damages as alleged above. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages from all the entity defendants, and punitive damages from Chief Powers, in his individual capacity only.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Supervisory Liability – 42 U.S.C. § 1983

(Against Supervising Officer Coddington and Does 1-10)

106. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if re-alleged herein.

107. Supervising Officer Coddington and Does 1-10 acted in a supervisory capacity under color of law.

108. The acts and failures of Supervising Officer Coddington and Does 1-10 were a cause of the sexual abuse of Plaintiff and other conduct by Officer Calderon, which deprived Plaintiff of her particular rights under the First, Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments, as alleged above.

109. The Supervising Officer Coddington and Does 1-10 knew and had been put on notice that their subordinate Officer Calderon was engaging in conduct in violation of written policy and knew or reasonably should have known that his conduct would deprive Plaintiff of these rights.

110. The Supervising Officer Coddington and Does 1-10 failed to act to prevent Officer Calderon, their subordinate, from engaging in such conduct.

111. The known or obvious consequence of training deficiencies and the

1 failures to enforce written policies would be to cause subordinates like Officer
2 Calderon to violate Plaintiff's constitutional rights;

3 112. The Supervising Officer Coddington and Does 1-10 disregarded this
4 consequence.

5 113. These training deficiencies and the failures to enforce written policies
6 resulted in the deprivation of Plaintiff's rights by Officer Calderon.

7 114. The Supervising Officer Coddington and Does 1-10 engaged in conduct
8 that showed a reckless or callous indifference to the deprivation by their subordinates
9 of the rights of others.

10 115. The conduct of Supervising Officer Coddington and Does 1-10 was
11 willful, wanton, malicious, or done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of
12 Plaintiff and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as
13 to each of those defendants.

14 **NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 **Violation of Civil Rights – 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1988**

16 **Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights**

17 (Against All Individual County Defendants)

18 116. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained in
19 the foregoing paragraphs as if re-alleged herein.

20 117. This cause of action arises under United States Code, Title 42, Sections
21 1983 and 1988, wherein Plaintiffs seeks to redress a deprivation under color of law of a
22 right, privilege or immunity secured to herself by the First, Eighth and Fourteenth
23 Amendments to the United States Constitution.

24 118. Defendants Officer Calderon, Officer Ibanez, Officer Gonzalez,
25 Supervisor Officer Coddington, Chief Powers, and Does 1-10, and each of them:

26 (a) had a joint and simultaneous duty to make sure that Plaintiff was not
27 sexually assaulted;

28 (b) had joint and simultaneous knowledge that Plaintiff was at risk of

1 being sexually assaulted by Officer Calderon;

2 (c) with such duty, knowledge and a meeting of the minds, took action at
 3 the same time and in the same place to collaborate to refuse to protect
 4 Plaintiff from Officer Calderon's sexual assaults. Thus, forming a 'pact of
 5 denial' such that for the months that Plaintiff was subject to Officer
 6 Calderon's sexual assaults – after the individual defendants had been
 7 alerted to the danger Officer Calderon posed to Plaintiff – not a single
 8 one of them did anything to intervene on Plaintiff's behalf or prevent the
 9 sexual assaults of Plaintiff;

10 (d) acted as described herein above, in conspiracy with, and with the
 11 agreement permission, ratification, and approval of, each other to violate
 12 Plaintiff's civil rights as stated herein.

13 119. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts, omissions
 14 and deliberate indifference of each of the defendants, Plaintiff was harmed.

16 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

17 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows against defendants:

- 18 1. General and compensatory damages in an amount according to proof;
- 19 2. Special damages in an amount according to proof;
- 20 3. Exemplary and punitive damages against each individual and Doe
 21 defendant, but not against the County or LACPD, in amounts according
 22 to proof;
- 23 4. Cost of suit, including attorneys' fees, under 42 U.S.C. § 1988; and

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //2

